

Remarks

A. Status

Claims 1-21 were pending. Claims 22-45 are withdrawn. Claims 20-21 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 4 and 12-16 have been amended. Claims 1-19 will be pending upon entry of this response. No new matter has been added.

B. Election of Claims

Applicants acknowledge that claims 1-21 were elected, without traverse, previously.

C. Objections to Drawings

Applicants thank the Examiner for noting inadvertent deficiencies in the drawings. For example, FIG. 32A was mislabeled as FIG. 31A. This figure has been corrected. A substitute sheet is included with this response at **Tab A**.

D. Objections to Disclosure

The Examiner has objected to the brief description of the drawings. FIGS. 27-32 were inadvertently not included. FIGS. 23 and 24 inadvertently did not indicate parts A and B of those figures. These issues have been corrected by way of amendment to the specification. Applicants believe that the amendments overcome this objection.

E. Double Patenting

Claims 1 and 12-16 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of U.S. application Serial No. 10/225,446. Claims 1 and 12-16 have been rejected under the same doctrine, in view of U.S. application Serial No. 10/751,586. Included with this response at **Tab B** are two terminal disclaimers that overcome these objections. As the Office (and public) should be aware, the filing of terminal disclaimers

does not create any estoppel or presumption regarding the merits of the rejection. *Quad Environmental Tech. Corp. v. Union Sanitary Dist.*, 946 F.2d 870 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

F. Rejections Under § 112


Claims 4, 12-16, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner notes that claim 4 lacks proper antecedent basis. That claim has been amended to overcome this rejection by correcting its dependency.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 12-16 may be confusing due to the use of the phrase “resistance.” Those claims have been amended to correct an inadvertent typographical error. Applicants believe that these amendments overcome this rejection.

Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected for their recitation of “a device.” These claims have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants note that this cancelation does not affect claim scope, as the allowed claims cover situations in which the claimed device is arranged in series or parallel with another device. In view of the claim cancelations, this rejection is believed to be moot.

G. Conclusion

Applicants believe that this is a complete response to the Office Action mailed on May 27, 2005. Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or additional concerning, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at 512/536-3018.



Respectfully submitted,

Michael C. Barrett

Michael C. Barrett
Reg. No. 44,523
Attorney for Applicants

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2400
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: 512-536-3018
Facsimile: 512-536-4598

Date: August 11, 2005